

splendid with crystal chandeliers and precious shrines.

Besides the *imāmbāfā* burials, the tradition of mausolea continued with those of Sa'ādat 'Alī Khān (1798-1814) and his wife Khurshīd-zāda, built by his successor Ghāzī al-Dīn Haydar (1814-27). Both follow the organisation of Safdar Dīang's monument with corner turrets capped by *chattris* around the main dome, but the *pishṭāk* and *iwān* are absent, replaced in the former by a tetrastyle portico on each face (R. Smith, *Journal* 1832, V & A. IM 15/58-1915, pp. 581-2). Both have domes of a strongly European profile, with prominent finials and salient angles around a tall drum suggesting a derivation from *Les Invalides* (1693-1706); the accumulation of lesser domes and *baṅglā* vaults around the Queen's tomb also recalls Hindu massing. Ghāzī al-Dīn built his own tomb, the Shāh Nadīaf (Nadīaf Ashraf) dominated by a white, stupa-like dome and finial within an arcaded precinct. The garden at Husaynābād contains two supposed replicas of the Tādī Maḥall for a daughter of Muḥammad 'Alī Shāh and her husband, which however demonstrate complete lack of its classical balance.

The origin of European influences is apparent in domestic buildings. Initially Sa'ādat Khān had taken over the Panč Maḥall built by the Shaykhzādas in the Fort; the buildings were improved on a grand scale by Shudjā' al-Dawla (1754-75), but by 1775 they still lacked unity (Modave, *op. cit.* 183). Both palace and fortifications were destroyed in 1857 and after. Aṣaf al-Dawla transferred the court to a new Dawlat Khāna including the Aṣafī Kothī, probably commissioned from Claude Martin, in 1782-9. Martin, who had arrived in Lakhnaw in 1776, rose to become advisor to the Nawwābs, whose taste he influenced, creating fine buildings for them and obtaining furniture from Europe. These included Mūsā Bāgh (Barowen) (1780-1804), a classical house with a bow front to the river, and a landward court sunk for coolness, and Bībīyapur Kothī, a much plainer building. His own town house, Farḥat-bakhsh (1781) shows the same combination of climatic ingenuity, strong defences, and wit; it was bought in 1800 by Sa'ādat 'Alī Khān, who used it as his residence at the centre of a new palace complex. Constantia (La Martinière (1795-1800) though influential was, as Martin's tomb, unsuitable for adoption, and continues in his endowment as a school. Dil-kushā (ca. 1805), built by Sir Gore Ouseley as a reinterpretation of Seaton Delaval back home in Northumberland (1729) became a favourite hunting lodge of Sa'ādat 'Alī, and provided the portico model for his tomb. By 1803 the Nawwāb had bought all the English houses but three, and himself constructed a fine new street of such houses, radically different from the Indian model, in Ḥaḍrat-gandī. The building of palaces continued with his domed Motī Maḥall and Lāl Bāradārī (Kaṣr al-Sultān), a throne room with *dīālīs* as fine as the Nadān Maḥall. Ghāzī al-Dīn built the Ḥattar Manzil, incorporating the Farḥat-bakhsh, for his harem, blending Martin's classicism with the local tendency to culminative recession, and domes with *ḥadīdīa* eaves, carrying gilded parasols. That these allusions were deliberate is confirmed in the Darshān Bilās, of whose four façades two are taken from Barowen, one from Farḥat-bakhsh, and one from Dil-kushā, much as the images in Urdū poetry (Jones, *op. cit.*, 224). The borrowing of Western motifs remained superficial, and even the use of such houses was not fully grasped. Such stylistic variety could be realised with ease in the local

medium of stucco on brickwork. This was fully exploited in the vast palace of Kayṣar Bāgh built for Wādīd 'Alī Shāh by Ḥófā Miyān in 1848-50; the final, Rococo phase of Mughal architecture is combined with the gamut of Western elements with a splendid and theatrical disregard for rule, but little now remains.

Bibliography: For references to the earlier state of buildings see: *Voyage en Inde du Comte de Modave 1773-1776*, ed. J. Deloche, Paris 1971, for 1775; W. Hodges, *Travels in India 1780-1783*, London 1794, 100 ff.; Père J. Tieffenthaler, *Description historique et géographique de l'Inde*, Berlin 1786-8, i, 250 ff. (with rough sketches); Bishop R. Heber, *Narrative of a journey through the upper provinces of India ... 1824-25*, London 1829, ii, 51 ff.; W. Hamilton, *The East India gazetteer*, London 1828, ii, 130 ff.; D. S. Dodgson, *General views and special points of interest in the city of Lucknow*, London 1860 (not accurate in detail); P. C. Mookherji, *Pictorial Lucknow*, Lucknow 1883 (perceptive). No adequate study of the city's architecture has yet been published, though there are two unpublished Ph.D. theses, B. Tandan, *The architecture of the Nawabs of Avadh between 1722 and 1865: a descriptive inventory and analysis of types*, Cambridge University, 6.2.1979, no. 10859-61, 3 vols., and R. Llewellyn-Jones, *The city of Lucknow before 1865 and its buildings*, University of London, July 1980 (primarily on European influence). For general works including references to Lucknow see HIND. For the development of late Mughal architecture see H. Goetz, *Late Indian architecture*, in *AO xviii* (1940), 81-102 (no plates of Lakhnaw), reprinted in *Marg*, xi/4 (1958), 11-18; idem, *The Qudsia Bagh at Delhi: key to late Mughal architecture*, in *IC*, xxvi/1 (1952), 132-53. For inventories of the buildings see *Archaeological survey of India*, n.s. ii: *N.W. provinces and Oudh*, ii, Allahabad 1891, 265-7; *Uttar Pradesh district gazetteers*, xxxvii, Lucknow, by V. C. Sharma, U.P. Revenue Dept. 1959, 391-405. For specific descriptions of buildings see G. Sanderson, *The Nadan Maḥall, Solah Khamba, and the tomb of Ibrāhīm Chishī, Lucknow*, in *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report 1912-13*, Calcutta 1916, 132-5 (with excellent plates); Ziyāud-dīn Desai, *Mosques of India*, New Delhi 1971, 69-71; *Gazetteer of the province of Oudh*, 1877, ii, 373 ff. Of the more recent guide-books, H. A. Newell, *Lucknow*, Bombay (?) n.d. (before 1928), is useful. (P. A. ANDREWS)

LAKHNAWTĪ (shortened form of Lakhanawati, "home of Lakhan", which is a derivation from *Lakshmanā*, son of Dasarata and half-brother of Rāma Čandrā, and *watī*, meaning "home" or "habitation", the name of an ancient city which served as the principal seat of government in Bengal under Muslim rule for nearly four centuries. Its ruins are still found spread over a narrow and deserted channel of the River Ganges in lat. 24° 52' N. and long. 88° 10' E., 10 miles/16 km. south-west of the modern Mālda town (administrative headquarters of Mālda district in the State of West Bengal, India), from which it is reached by a macadamised road.

Though the date of the foundation of the city is shrouded in obscurity, tradition has it that it was built by one Sangaldīb of the Cooch Behar area of north Bengal, who had become unchallenged master of Bengal and Bihār after defeating Rādīja Kedar Brahmin of the same region. But the recorded